

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant Upper Mokelumne River Watershed County Amador, San Joaquin &

Authority Calaveras

Project TitleMokelumne WatershedGrant Request\$ 878,605

Interregional Sustainability **Total Project Cost** \$ 1,258,770 Evaluation (WISE) Program

Project Description The Northeastern San Joaquin County Groundwater Banking Authority (GBA) and the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) submit this Prop 84, Round 2 Interregional Planning Grant Proposal on behalf of the Mokelumne/Amador/Calaveras (MAC) and Eastern San Joaquin (ESJ) Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Regions to jointly complete the Mokelumne Watershed Interregional Sustainability Evaluation (WISE) Program. The Mokelumne WISE Program will (1) resolve conflicts related to the timing and availability of water resources, the demand for water supplies, and competing needs of water right holders and the environment, (2) evaluate alternatives for integrated water management on an interregional scale, providing benefits to a broad range of Mokelumne River basin stakeholders, (3) select a mutually preferred program alternative, and (4) develop an implementation plan to implement the preferred interregional alternative. The Mokelumne WISE Program will identify a mutually-beneficial solution that uses

water resources from the Mokelumne Watershed to assist in correcting groundwater overdraft conditions in the Eastern San Joaquin Groundwater Basin. Both Regions are currently updating their respective IRWMPs to meet

Evaluation Summary

plan standards.

| Scoring Criterion | Score |
|---------------------|-------|
| Work Plan | 15 |
| DAC Involvement | 6 |
| Schedule | 4 |
| Budget | 6 |
| Program Preferences | 5 |
| Tie Breaker | 0 |
| Total Score | 36 |

- Work Plan The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Although a standards compliant plan is not the focus of the Proposal, the need for the work is justified. The Work Plan states that each IRWM region (Mokelumne-Amador-Calaveras and Eastern San Joaquin) is working towards IRWM Plans that meet all 16 plan standards. The regions have come together to develop a water resource management program that will evaluate water supply, conjunctive use options, groundwater recharge options, environmental opportunities/constraints and technical and economical feasibilities for the benefit of both regions.
- ➤ <u>DAC Involvement</u> The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. Task 8 includes the development of "Public and DAC Outreach Plan" that will solicit input from DACs through the Watershed Interregional Sustainability Evaluation (WISE) Program development. However, it is unclear how the DAC input will be addressed and incorporated into the WISE Program or the IRWM planning process.
- Schedule The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation. While the Schedule is logical and consistent with the Work Plan and Budget, Task 10.2 (Consultant Contract Administration), is omitted and Task 10.3 (Reporting), is reported as Task 10.2. Also, some deliverable



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program - Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

completion dates are not identified such as Subtask 1.2 (Joint program objectives for Mokelumne WISE Program), Subtask 1.3 (CEQA determination), and Subtask 8.2 (DAC public workshops, newsletters, project fact sheet, press releases and summary of DAC issues).

- ➤ <u>Budget</u> The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient. While the Budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule, some supporting documentation is questionable. Table 4.1 is not detailed and does not provide any language to support the data. The data presented in Table 4.3 has some discrepancies between the number of hours tabulated and assumptions noted that are not explained. The budget includes two facilitated meetings that are not specified in the Work Plan (Task 5 and Subtask 6.3), and, facilitator costs in Table 4.2 should be broken down and discussed.
- **Program Preference** The Proposal sufficiently demonstrates that 12 of the 15 Program Preferences and Statewide Priorities will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.